



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,504	06/13/2001	Thomas G. Hazel	MSFT 4936(160297.1)	5339
321	7590	01/04/2005	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102			VU, THANH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/880,504

Applicant(s)

HAZEL, THOMAS G.

Examiner

Thanh T. Vu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 06/24/04.

Claims 1-51 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claim 51 was added, and claims 1-4, 9, 11, 13, 16, 21-22, 24, 27, 32, 35-36, 41, 43, and 50 were amended. This action is made Final.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 4, 8, 14 – 17, 21, 27, and 44 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561.

As per claim 1, Malamud et al. ("Malamud") teaches a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:

forming a scope window displaying one or more scope items therein (see Malamud, figure 2, item 201; the examiner interprets window 201 as a scope window);

allowing a user to select at least one of the displayed scope items in the scope window (figs 2 and 7; scope window: 201 or 701; scope items: objects within a cope window or 702-704; col. 4, lines 46-50; col. 10, lines 54-60; col. 11, lines 1-7);

forming a first primary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying one or more first primary objects linked to the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 203, column 4, lines 47 – 50, and column 8, lines 62 – 67; the examiner interprets the contents of window 203 as first primary objects); and

forming a second primary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying one or more second primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the second primary objects displayed by the second primary display window are independent of the first primary objects displayed by the first primary display window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 207 as second primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for performing the step of forming a third primary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying third primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the third primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and wherein the third primary objects are independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project

Art Unit: 2174

group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for:

allowing a user to select at least one of the displayed first primary objects in the first primary display window (figs. 2 and 8; window 203 or 801; primary objects: objects in menu 209 or 804 or 806; col. 11, lines 46-50);

forming a first secondary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window; and

forming a second secondary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying second secondary objects linked to the first primary display window wherein the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 1).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 3 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable

medium of claim 3, having further computer-executable instructions for forming a third secondary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying third secondary objects linked to the first primary display window wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects and wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the second secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a third primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 2).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, wherein the scope window, the first primary display window and the second primary display window form a workspace view which is saved either as a local view on a local drive or as a global view in a database shared by multiple users (see Malamud, column 4, lines 30 – 34).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for defining window types, wherein the scope window, the first primary display window, and second primary display window are associated

Art Unit: 2174

with one of the window types (see Malamud, figure 2, items 201, 203, and 207, column 4, lines 47 - 57, and column 8, lines 41 - 47; it is inherent that the windows have a window type because window 201 is a folder window that is different from windows 203 and 207, which are application windows).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Malamud teaches the method of claim 14 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the window types include one or more of the following: a table, a graph, a list, a list control, a topological view, and a text window (see Malamud, figure 2, items 203 and 207; the examiner interprets windows 203 and 207 to be text windows).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 15 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 15, having further computer-executable instructions for allowing a user to convert one or more of the following from one of the window types to another of the window types: the scope window, the first primary display window, or second primary display window from one window type to another window type (see Malamud, column 6, line 63 - column 7, line 2; the examiner interprets a folder window as a window type and a project group folder window as another window type).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable

Art Unit: 2174

medium of claim 1, having further computer-executable instructions for performing the step of defining window types as a function of data driven from a query, wherein the type of driven data determines the window type (see Malamud, figure 5, items 502 and column 7, lines 10 – 20; the examiner interprets a folder window as a display type and a project group folder window as another display type, and it is inherent that a query to the status of the checkbox is made when displaying the window to determine whether the window is to be a project group folder window type or a regular folder window).

As per claim 21, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 27, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 44, it is of similar scope to claim 17 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 17 (see rejection above).

As per claim 45, it is of similar scope to claim 14 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 14 (see rejection above).

As per claim 46, it is of similar scope to claim 15 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15 (see rejection above).



Claims 41 – 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miklos, U.S. Patent No. 5,226,117.

As per claim 41, Miklos teaches a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:

forming a scope window displaying scope items therein (see Miklos, figure 2, item 100 and column 4, lines 54 – 56; the examiner interprets the Directory window 100 as a scope window);

allowing the user to select at least one of the scope items in the scope window (figs. 2 and 6; scope window 100; scope item: 40, 50, or 110; col. 4, lines 54-56);

forming a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope window (see Miklos, figure 2, item 40 and column 4, lines 54 – 56; the examiner interprets the FRIENDS nickname list window 40 as a first primary display window and the objects displayed therein are related to the Directory window 100);

allowing the user to select at least one of the first primary objects in the first primary display window (fig. 2; first primary display window 40; user can select items within the FRIENDS list 44);

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window (see Miklos, figure 2, item 50 and column 4, lines 63 – 67; the examiner interprets the department 6BM nickname list window 50 as a first secondary display

Art Unit: 2174

window and it is inherent that the objects displayed therein are related to the objects displayed in the FRIENDS nickname list window 40);

allowing the user to select at least one of the first secondary objects in the first secondary display window (fig. 2; col. 5, lines 31-37; first secondary display window 50; user can select items within the DEPARTMENT 6BM list 54);

linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary display window communicates with the scope window by focusing on the selected first secondary objects in the scope window, wherein the communication is independent of the communication between the first primary display window and the scope window (see Miklos, column 4, lines 63 – 67 and column 5, lines 21 – 31; col. 5, lines 38-47; col. 5, line 64-col. 6, line 11. The examiner considers the selected first secondary objects in the scope window is focused when all instances of the marked icon are located and updated dynamically).

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 41, Miklos teaches the method of claim 41 (see rejection above). Miklos further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 41, having further computer-executable instructions for:

assigning a particular object within the first secondary display window with a task list (see Miklos, column 5, lines 38 – 39; the examiner interprets indicating the desire to discard an object as setting a task list for an object);

sharing the assigned task list with other objects in the scope window (see Miklos, column 5, lines 38 – 39; it is inherent that the task list is shared by two objects because two objects are selected for discarding);

Art Unit: 2174

permitting the user to execute a new task on the particular object; and  
executing the new task on the other objects (see Miklos, column 6, lines 2 – 8; it is  
inherent that both selected objects are discarded upon user selection).

As per claim 43, it is of similar scope to claim 41 and is rejected under the same rationale  
as claim 41 (see rejection above).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all  
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Miklos, U.S. Patent No. 5,226,117.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1. Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 1, having

further computer-executable instructions for:

forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window; and

linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that a command or selection in the first secondary display window changes the focus or content of the scope window.

Miklos et al. ("Miklos") teaches forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window (see Miklos, column 4, lines 43 – 67); and linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that a command or selection in the first secondary display window changes the focus or content of the scope window (see Miklos, column 5, lines 21 – 31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud in order to allow concurrent entry and manipulation of data within grandparent and grandchild windows of the same application.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1. Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 1, wherein the linking between the first primary objects and the scope window is defined by an application developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to provide data to the first primary display window which determines how it will be displayed. Miklos teaches wherein the linking between first primary objects and a scope window is defined by an application developer

Art Unit: 2174

or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to provide data to the first primary display window which determines how it will be displayed (see Miklos, column 2, lines 23 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud in order to allow concurrent entry and manipulation of data within parent and child windows of the same application.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Malamud and Miklos teach the computer readable medium of claim 6 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 6, wherein the query operates on a database to display a selected set of the first primary objects in the first primary window. Miklos discloses wherein the query operates on a database to display a selected set of the first primary objects in the first primary window (see Miklos, column 1, lines 15 – 17 and 25 – 26; the examiner interprets a list of items as a database). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud in order concurrent entry and manipulation of stored data shared by parent and child windows of the same application.

Claims 9 – 13, 18 – 20, 22 – 26, 28, 30, 31 – 40, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Ku et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Malamud teaches the computer readable medium of claim 1 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 1, wherein allowing a user to select at least one displayed scope item in the scope window having further computer-executable instruction for: linking independently the first primary objects to the selected scope item and wherein the linking independently second primary objects to the selected scope item.

Ku et al. ("Ku") teaches computer-executable instructions for allowing a user to select at least one displayed scope item in the scope window, wherein first primary objects are linked to the selected scope item (see Ku, figure 3, items 310, 315 and 340, and column 4, lines 27 – 36; the examiner interprets window 310 as a scope window and nodes displayed therein as scope items, and window 315 as a first primary window and nodes displayed therein as first primary objects and it is inherent that the nodes displayed in window 315 are linked to parent node 340 in window 310) and wherein second primary objects are linked to the selected scope item (see Ku, figure 3, item 350 and column 4, lines 27 – 36; it is inherent that node 350 can have a new window created that contains a sub-tree with node 350 as the root node and a visual link to the parent node of node 350, node 340, as shown in window 315). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the computer-executable instructions of Ku with the computer readable medium of Malamud in order to provide for an

Art Unit: 2174

improved user interface that enables users to more easily and effectively navigate through complex hierarchies of information stored in a computer system.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Malamud and Ku teach the computer readable medium of claim 9 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 9, having further computer-executable instructions for forming a third primary display window displaying third primary objects linked to the selected scope item wherein the third primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and wherein the third primary objects are independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, Malamud and Ku teach the computer readable medium of claim 9 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 9, having further computer executable instruction for: allowing the users selects at least one first primary object in the first primary display window, forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object; and forming a second secondary display window displaying second secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object wherein the second secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it

Art Unit: 2174

is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 1).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Malamud and Ku teach the computer readable medium of claim 11 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 11, having further computer-executable instructions for forming a third secondary display window displaying third secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the first secondary objects and wherein the third secondary objects are independent of the second secondary objects (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a third primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 2).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Malamud and Ku teach the method of claim 11 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 11 wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first display window, and said computer-readable medium having further computer-executable instructions for:



forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object; and

linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary objects displayed in the first secondary display window are linked to the selected scope item in the scope window.

Ku teaches forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the selected first primary object (see Ku, figure 4, items 415, 420, 440 and 460, and column 4, lines 27 – 36; the examiner interprets window 415 as a first primary window and nodes displayed therein as first primary items, and window 420 as a first secondary window and nodes displayed therein as first secondary objects and it is inherent that the nodes displayed in window 420 are linked to parent node 460 in window 415); and linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary objects displayed in the first secondary display window are linked to the selected scope item in the scope window (see Ku, figure 4, items 440, 462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and 470). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Ku with the computer readable medium of Malamud in order to clearly signify hierarchical relationships in a tree structure displayed across multiple windows.

As per claim 18, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 19, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, Malamud and Ku teach the method of claim 18 (see rejection above). Malamud does not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 18 wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first primary display window and further comprising: a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the scope window.

Ku teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 18 wherein the users selects at least one first primary object in the first display window and further comprising: a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the scope window (see Ku, figure 4, items 440, 462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and 470). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Ku with the method of Malamud in order to clearly signify hierarchical relationships in a tree structure displayed across multiple windows.

As per claim 22, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 12, Malamud and Ku teach the computer readable medium of claim 12 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the method of

Art Unit: 2174

claim 21 further comprising the step of forming a third primary display window displaying third primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the third primary objects are independent of the first primary objects and wherein the third primary objects are independent of the second primary objects (see Malamud, figure 2, item 208 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 208 as third primary objects and it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 24, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 25, it is of similar scope to claim 12 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 26, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

As per claim 28, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 30, it is of similar scope to claim 8 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8 (see rejection above).

As per claim 31, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 32, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 33, it is of similar scope to claim 12 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12 (see rejection above).

As per claim 34, it is of similar scope to claim 13 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13 (see rejection above).

As per claim 35, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9 (see rejection above).

As per claim 36, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 37, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale

as claim 20 (see rejection above).

As per claim 38, it is of similar scope to claim 9 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 18 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, it is of similar scope to claim 11 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11 (see rejection above).

As per claim 40, it is of similar scope to claim 20 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20 (see rejection above).

As per claim 51, Malamud teaches the system of claim 35 wherein means for linking the second primary display window to the scope window is in response to the selected item by the user (col. 7, lines 31-43).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Ku et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072 as applied to claim 28 above further in view of Miklos, U.S. Patent No. 5,226,117.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Malamud and Ku teach the method of claim 28 (see rejection above). Malamud and Ku do not teach the method of claim 28 wherein the linking between the first primary objects and the scope window is defined by an application

Art Unit: 2174

developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary objects in the first primary display window.

Miklos teaches wherein the linking between first primary objects and a scope window is defined by an application developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary objects in the first primary display window (see Miklos, column 2, lines 23 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer readable medium of Malamud and Ku in order to allow concurrent entry and manipulation of data within parent and child windows of the same application.

Claims 47 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Brooks, U.S. Patent No. 6,008,809.

As per claim 47, Malamud teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a data structure, comprising:

- a scope window displaying scope items therein and allowing a user to select at least one displayed scope item (see Malamud, figure 2, item 201; the examiner interprets window 201 as a scope window);

- a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope

Art Unit: 2174

window and having an edge adjacent an edge of the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 203, column 4, lines 47 – 50, and column 8, lines 62 – 67; the examiner interprets the contents of window 203 as first primary objects); and

a second primary display window displaying second primary objects linked to the scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 207 as second primary objects).

Malamud does not teach a second primary display window having an edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge. Brooks teaches a window having an edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge (see Brooks, figures 12 – 14, items 502, 504 and 524 and column 10, lines 25 – 36 and 49 – 59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Brooks with the method of Malamud in order to allow multiple windows to be viewed on the same level, without the time consuming process of having to resize and position multiple windows.

As per claim 48, which is dependent on claim 47, Malamud and Brooks teach the computer readable medium of claim 47 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 47 wherein the linking between the second primary objects and the scope window is independent of the linking between the first primary objects and the

Art Unit: 2174

scope window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually).

As per claim 49, which is dependent on claim 48, Malamud and Brooks teach the computer readable medium of claim 48 (see rejection above). Malamud further teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 48 further comprising:

a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window; and

a second secondary display window displaying second secondary objects linked to the first primary display window wherein the linking between the second secondary objects and the first primary display window is independent of the linking between the first secondary objects and the first primary display window (see Malamud, column 11, lines 21 – 36; it is taught that a project group can contain a sub-project group and that a sub-project group is a project group. Therefore, it is inherent that the sub-project group displays a project group window containing linked child objects and child windows when opened. It is also inherent then that this sub project group window has a first primary window and a second primary window as taught for a project group in the rejection for claim 1).

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al.,



U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 in view of Brooks, U.S. Patent No. 6,008,809 as applied to claim 28 above further in view of Ku et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072.

As per claim 50, which is dependent on claim 48, Malamud and Brooks teach the computer readable medium of claim 48 (see rejection above). Malamud and Brooks do not teach the computer-readable medium of claim 48 wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first primary display window and wherein a first secondary display window displays first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the scope window.

Ku teaches wherein the user selects at least one first primary object in the first display window and wherein a first secondary display window displays first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window and linked to the scope window (see Ku, figure 4, items 440, 462, 470 and 472; it is inherent that node 462 is linked to node 440 through links 472 and 470). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Ku with the method of Malamud and Brooks in order to clearly signify hierarchical relationships in a tree structure displayed across multiple windows.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Claims 1-4, 8, 14-17, 21, 24, and 44-46, applicant argues the following:

a. Malamud does not teach the second primary objects in the second primary display window are independent of the primary objects displayed by the first display window.

b. window 201 of Fig. 2 of the Malamud should not be interpreted as scope window because it fails to provide a drill down tree structure of the entire tree.

The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

a. Malamud teaches the second primary objects in the second primary display window are independent of the primary objects displayed by the first display window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 207 as second primary objects and it is noted that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually (see fig. 8; menu 807; Minimize → Window or Close; col. 11, lines 48-50).

b. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., window 201 of Fig. 2 of the Malamud should not be interpreted as scope window because it fails to provide a drill down tree structure of the entire tree) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the examiner considers project window 201 of Fig. 2 as a scope window.

Claims 41-43, applicant argues that Milkos patent should not be interpreted as a scope window because window 100 fails to provide drill down hierarchical display of the items within

Art Unit: 2174

the scope window. The examiner does not agree because it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. drill down hierarchical display of the items within the scope window) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the examiner considers directory window 100 of Fig. 2 as a scope window.

Claims 5-7, applicant argues “while updating the directory window 100 when the item 61 and 63 are updated, fails to teach an independent link between the selected secondary object in the first secondary display window and the scope window such that the selected secondary object will be displayed and focused in the scope window”. The examiner does not agree because it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., ... independent link... focused...) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the features of the claims are rejected as explained above.

Claims 9-13, 18-20, 22-26, 28, and 31-40, applicant also argues that it is not inherent that node 350 (of fig. 3 in Ku’ reference) can have a new window created that contains a sub-tree with node 350 as the root node and a visual link to the parent node of node 350, node 340, as shown in window 315. The examiner does not agree because Ku teaches node 350 can have a new window created that contains a sub-tree with node 350 as the root node and a visual link to

Art Unit: 2174

the parent node of node 350, node 340, as shown in window 315 (fig. 3; col. 4, lines 28-37 and lines 60-65).

Claim 28 and 29, applicant argues that the cited reference does not teach linking the secondary primary objects is independent of linking the first primary objects and that the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary object in the first primary display window. The examiner does not agree because Ku and Miklos teaches linking the secondary primary objects is independent of linking the first primary objects (Ku, fig. 3; col. 4, lines 28-37 and lines 60-65) and that the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary object in the first primary display window (Miklos, col. 2, lines 23-45; col. 5, line 49 – col. 6, line 8).

Claims 47-49, applicant argues that Mulamud and Brooks fail to teach the features of claim 47 of a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope window and having edge adjacent an edge of the scope window and a second primary display window displaying second primary objects linked to the scope window and having edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge. The examiner does not agree because Mulamud and Brooks' references read on the claim language of a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope window and having edge adjacent an edge of the scope window (see Mulamud, figure 2, window 203, column 4, lines 47 – 50, and column 8, lines 62 – 67; the examiner interprets the contents of window 203 as first primary objects) and a second primary display window

Art Unit: 2174

displaying second primary objects linked to the scope window and having edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or and edge of the primary window (see Malamud, figure 2, item 207 and column 4, lines 47 – 50, column 8, lines 62 – 67 and column 11, lines 48 – 61; the examiner interprets the contents of window 207 as second primary objects) wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge (see Brooks, figures 12 – 14, items 502, 504 and 524 and column 10, lines 25 – 36 and 49 – 59).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

*Kristine Kincaid*  
**KRISTINE KINCAID**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

***Inquiries***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu